



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

necessary organs for dealing with international disputes, establishing the necessary procedure, formulating national rights, and ensuring the observation of laws and conventions. The activities of the group culminated in 1917 in the formation of a league for a society of nations based on an international constitution. The well-known French Deputy, M. Hennessy, has taken a leading part throughout, and the organization of the French society is in some respects on a wider basis than the corresponding League of Nations Society in this country, as it admits not only individual members, but delegates from the various parties, groups, and associations in France, provided they are agreed on the ideas for which the society stands. It does not concern itself with the origin of the war, but with the question of the prevention of war in the future.

The program of the French society is fully set out in the recently published numbers of its organ. "The central idea which, a short time ago, was regarded as Utopian, is becoming the great preoccupation of the day. The desire of the French society is to study the problems and to bring to their solution practical answers. The hour has come to spread widely those conclusions which have already been arrived at, and to defend them with the obstinacy which a good conscience confers, against all the retrograde minds which oppose progress. To this end we appeal to all men of good will, without distinction of party, religious, or philosophic opinion."

In its message to the delegates of the Russian Soviet, the French league proposed that the latter should appoint a commission to study the questions which must be faced if war is to be avoided in the future, and advised that consultation should take place with groups of persons of allied and neutral countries interested in the same questions, in order that ideas might be harmonized and co-ordinated. It urged on the interallied parliamentary meeting, which took place in May, the consideration of the constitution of a society of nations, or at least that the study of these questions should be proposed to the respective parliaments of the nations concerned.

THE HIGH DUTY OF NEUTRALS

Fridtjof Nansen, in an interview appearing in the *American Scandinavian Review*, has declared his interpretation of the duty of neutrals: "It is the task of the neutrals to keep unbroken the chain of human development." Elaborating this conception of his country's high usefulness despite its somewhat anomalous position as one of the chief victims of the Central Powers, he continues:

Something new will rise out of this war. A new sense of human brotherhood will be born of its hatreds. Already there is a growing body of internationalists in every country, and they are not so small a minority as might appear on the surface. But they must not fall into the mistake of trying to wipe out all national peculiarities and substituting a new international culture. Even if it could be done, such a culture would be barren. We still need patriotism, not to breed enmities as in the past, but to stimulate each nation to its highest possibilities. Each has something special to give, and I, for one, mourn when I see a nation disappear from the face of the earth.

All culture is first national, and grows and expands as various races meet and fructify one another. . . .

BRIEF PEACE NOTES

WHEN President Wilson says, as he has, that the Germans must throw off their present masters before any notion of their participation in a Society of Nations can be entertained by the Allies, he is making no original statement, says Dr. Alfred H. Fried, but, instead of raising a new point, is merely climbing onto the platform constructed several years ago by Dr. Fried, Nobel Prize Man, German pacifist leader who kept out of jail by crossing into Switzerland, and editor of *Die Friedens Warte*. This he points out in the course of a scornful discussion of the German plaint that President Wilson is "interfering" in German internal affairs. He writes:

The representatives of the democratic spirit in Germany do not possess the necessary backbone, else they would not have been so thoroughly embarrassed by President Wilson's demand for the democratization of Germany just because the reactionaries declaimed, all in one voice: "Ah, you want just exactly what our enemies want!" In view of the fact that Germany has twenty-five enemies, it is difficult to wish for anything for Germany which an enemy does not want. These shouters for "triumph" should have been answered by being made ridiculous. Are we not to work for that which is good simply because it is the desire of an enemy, who wants it because it benefits him also? Are we therefore to keep autocracy and militarism simply because a democratic Germany gave other nations advantages which, seen in the right light, would also be beneficial to us? Are we to translate into practical use the old anecdote: "It will serve my father right if my hands freeze off. Why doesn't he buy me some mittens?" And why did German democrats fear the windy arguments of their opponents to such an extent that they forget their own ancient demands in view of the desires of Wilson?

If some one had suggested to me that I stood entirely on Wilson's platform, I would reply: "You are mistaken, my friend; Wilson is standing entirely on my own. I made these same demands at the time when the President of the United States was still a figure in the twilight of history. I am pleased today to have such a mighty colleague in this effort. So might the German democrats speak who since 1848 have demanded what the world asks today for the general good of humankind, including Germany."

Away with such false shame and away with "democrats" like Dr. Julius Lessner (Privy Councillor), who thinks that he must make such concessions to the blood-besotted pack of reactionaries that he speaks of Wilson as a friend "from whom may God protect us," and who tries to make his highly important note to the Pope ridiculous as a salving tract.

. . . Our State Department has been virtually accused of "giving aid and comfort to the enemy" by its inability to define its policies so that they may be readily and clearly understood by the German people. This point was lately made by Norman Angell in an address before the League for Democratic Control in Boston. He said:

At the present time the enemy governments are trying to persuade their peoples that defeat for Germany must mean the destruction of German nationality and the economic opportunity of her future children. Against such a fate any people good, bad, or indifferent, savage or civilized, will fight to the end. This effort of the enemy governments to stiffen the resistance of their people, we are directly aiding by our refusal to state clearly what we mean by the destruction of German militarism. Does that mean that Germany is to have no means of defense in the future? That she is to be manifestly inferior in power and that we are to have no responsibility for her protection? Then, whatever the responsibility for the beginning of the war, the Germans are fighting for the right to defend themselves.

Such a situation undoes the work of the blockade. We hope by pressure upon the civil population to produce readi-

ness for peace—and undo the effect by furnishing the German people with the strongest possible motive which any nation can have for continuing a war. That aid to the enemy governments must be withdrawn. Until the safety of Germany is assured German militarism will be supported by the German people, and however we may crush them, be a constant menace to the rest of Europe.

. . . At least one person in this country is aware of the dangers latent in the tools we are now using in the work of excavation for the foundations of a durable peace. "Unless some conscience is aroused that natural science is not to be used against man, but for him, then it will never be safe for this world," declared Dr. Ira N. Hollis recently at the annual meeting in New York City of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers. The duty of engineers, he averred, lay no more in perfecting and advancing the science of their profession than in assisting to make the world safe from the misuse of scientific discoveries. "It is our task to assist in making the world safe against the forces that we have unloosened, so that the century may not close with a total failure of the civilization of Christian races." He continued:

It is we who have developed the applications of natural science, and it is we who are using it to destroy one another, forced into the struggle by the rulers of a nation that knows no right except might, and no mercy except that which is taught by the sword. The twentieth century is still young, and we do not yet know what it will represent to the future historian. Will it be the debauch of natural science, or will it mean a new birth to Christianity? It is the engineers' task to decide this. There are two tendencies: one toward greater comfort and luxury, and one toward greater service. The first can plunge us only deeper and deeper into war for the control of a commercial output. It can only bring us more firmly under a governing class derived either by birth or by commercial success. The second means the complete emancipation of the individual trained to think of service as the chief source of good government and happiness in life. The only theory that will hold men together is that of service.

. . . In a recent public statement Dr. Sidney L. Gulick, Secretary of the Commission on International Justice and Good Will of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, calls attention to the less conspicuous Missions from Japan, which have been working as earnestly as the celebrated Ishii Mission, and for results in their own way as indispensable as the objects of their diplomatic confrères. These include a group of fifteen important Japanese educators, principals and superintendents of schools, who have been inspecting the schools of the United States; an Economic Mission, consisting of nine men especially conversant with questions of finance and industry, whose object is not only to study general problems of finance, but to devise means as well for the promotion of American-Japanese trade, and a Parliamentary Mission, whose members had the opportunity of sounding out thoroughly the labor situation in this country, and were able to come to terms of frankness and friendliness with the leaders of organized labor in California and in the National Capital as well.

. . . One view of the Japanese position in the war is given in a recent address by Dr. T. Iyenage, himself a Japanese and head of the East and West News Bureau, delivered before the Rotary Club of New York City. Dr. Iyenage is recognized as an authority on Japanese policy, although his views are in no sense to be regarded as official. "Japan," he declared on this occasion, "is

ready to do everything within her power to see the Allies win." A distinction, however, would seem to be made between seeing the Allies win and participating to a reckless extent in the actual steps thereto, for the Doctor goes on to explain that "for Japan to go into the war in the West would be entirely out of harmony with the farsighted policy that should guide Japan," as her military prestige would be impaired thereby, and cause would be given for the cry of "yellow peril." Further, "sending troops to Europe would be a discourtesy," and those who advocate sending Japanese troops to Russia "ignore the tendencies of the Russian people." As reported in the press, his only disclosure of the active part that Japan may play in "seeing the Allies win" is made in the sentence: "It is necessary that Japan shall use her vast influence in the Orient, just as in the Occident the United States on one side of the Atlantic and democratic countries of Europe on the other side must take the lead."

. . . A resolution calling for immediate steps by this country towards official consideration of a possible organization of a league of nations, proposed in Congress by Representative London, Socialist, reads:

Resolved, by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, That the Congress of the United States shall initiate the organization of an international league to secure a durable peace, and for that purpose shall, through the President of the United States, invite the representatives of the parliaments of all the countries now at war with the Central Powers to convene in joint conference to be held at the city of Washington, District of Columbia.

. . . In his annual report Secretary of the Navy Daniels urges the consideration at the eventual peace conference of a proposal for an international navy. He says:

To this international navy, composed of separate naval establishments of all nations, each nation should contribute in proportion to its wealth and population, or upon some plan to insure that no nation can safely challenge the decrees of the high international court. To such a police of the sea this country will be ready to make full contribution, and to that end the expansion that now crowds all the old and new shipbuilding resources will soon place this country in a position to furnish as many and as powerful ships as will come from any other country. It would be a lasting calamity if, when this war ends, there should linger as a burden upon a people already heavily taxed by wars a competitive programme of costly naval construction. This country will no doubt take its proper place in bringing about such provisions in the peace treaties as will never again constrain any nation to adapt its naval programme to the programme of some other nation from which there is the compelling menace of possible and unprovoked attack.

. . . *Die Freie Zeitung*, of Berne, Switzerland, Siegfried Streicher, editor, is a new publication described as the organ of those leaders of German freedom now exiled in Switzerland. In the first copy, published a few days after the United States joined the World War, the policy of the magazine is stated as follows:

The principles that we shall defend in the columns of our new paper have until now found no defender in the German language. These are the principles of democratic-republican popular rights, proclaimed by the great French Revolution. . . . The world war is being fought to decide whether these principles shall be surrendered or go on to victory. We think that in this war it will not be the Germans or the French, not the Austrians or the Turks, not the

Russians, the English, or Americans who will win, but these principles.

From the very first we wish to say very clearly that we must not be understood as being at enmity with Germany. Such words as "enemies of the Allies, friends of Germany," etc., have in our eyes no meaning. He who wishes to make conquest of autocracy cannot be understood as expressing himself against Germany; on the other hand, he demands the emancipation of the German people from an outlived governmental system, and he is in this sense of demanding popular and human liberties, a friend of the German people. . . .

. . . The People's Council of America is reputed to be starting a new campaign with the slogan "Peace by negotiation—NOW." Commenting upon this slogan, the Fort Worth. (Texas) *Star-Telegram* points to the fact that this nation may almost be said to be already fed up on "peace by negotiation." This paper draws up for the reader's convenience a partial brief history of the failure to secure anything by negotiation with Germany except a smouldering inaction. This runs as follows:

1. December 24, 1914. Admiral von Tirpitz throws out hints in newspaper interview of a wholesale torpedoing policy. He directly asks, "What will America say?" This was considerably before the so-called English blockade was causing Germany a serious food problem.

2. February 4, 1915. German Government proclaims a war zone within which any ship may be sunk unwarned.

3. February 10, 1915. Mr. Wilson tells German Government it will be held to "strict accountability" if any American rights are violated in this way.

4. May 1 (dated April 22), 1915. German embassy publishes in New York morning papers warning against taking passage on ships which our Government had told the people they had a perfect right to take.

The *Lusitania* sailed at 12:20 noon, May 1.

5. May 7, 1915. Sinking of *Lusitania*.

6. May 13, 1915. Mr. Wilson's "first *Lusitania* note."

7. May 28, 1915. Germany's reply defending the sinking of the *Lusitania*.

8. June 9, 1915. Mr. Wilson's "second *Lusitania* note."

9. July 21, 1915. Mr. Wilson's "third *Lusitania* note" (following more unsatisfactory German rejoinders).

10. August 19, 1915. Sinking of the *Arabic*, whereupon Von Bernstorff gave an oral pledge for his government that hereafter German submarines would not sink "liners" without warning.

11. February, 1916. (After still more debatable sinkings) Germany makes proposals looking toward "assuming liability" for *Lusitania* victims, but the whole case is soon complicated again by the "armed ship" issue.

12. March 24, 1916. Sinking of the *Sussex*, passenger vessel with Americans on board.

April 10, 1916. Germany cynically tells United States she cannot be sure whether she sunk the *Sussex* or not, although admitting one of her submarines was active close to the place of the disaster.

14. April 18, 1916. President Wilson threatens Germany with breach of diplomatic relations if *Sussex* and similar incidents are repeated.

15. May 4, 1916. Germany grudgingly makes the promise that ships will not be sunk without warning.

16. October 8, 1916. German submarine appears off American coast and sinks British passenger steamer *Strophano*, with many American passengers (vacationists returning from New Foundland) on board. Loss of life almost certain had not American men-of-war been on hand to pick up the refugees.

(From this time until final break several other vessels sunk under circumstances which made it at least doubtful whether Germany was living up to her pledges.)

17. January 31, 1917. Germany tears up her promises and notifies Mr. Wilson she will begin "unrestricted submarine war."

18. February 3, 1917. Mr. Wilson gives Count Bernstorff his passports and recalls Ambassador Gerard from Berlin.

. . . While we may never be able to determine satisfactorily which came first, the hen or the egg, Jean Finot, editor of *La Revue*, in a recent editorial in that magazine, calls attention to the fact that we shall one day know definitely which comes first in international development, and whether brooding peace will hatch a Society of Nations, or whether from the organization of a Society of Nations peace will finally emerge. He points to the difficulties in the path of peacemakers in the facts that Allied victory "will procure at least a dozen new units in the list of nations," and that some basis of equality of representation and action must be effected between a great number of national units, varying disproportionately in size, strength, population, and commercial or military activity. To the final peace agreement "neutrals as well as belligerents must be invited, the smallest countries must have an equal voice with the biggest. Enforcing peace M. Finot ranks as "driving out the devil of national militarism by the Beelzebub of international militarism."

. . . The following comparison of the platforms evolved at last summer's "Stockholm Conference" by the Dutch-Scandinavians and by the Russian Socialists was prepared by William English Walling for the New York *Tribune*. Mr. Walling finds both platforms distinctly pro-German. The initials in parentheses indicate the originators of the separate planks. "D-S" refers to the Dutch-Scandinavians and "R. C." to the representatives of the Russian Council of Workmen and Soldiers:

1. Democratization of Germany.
The German Socialists are to strive for democratization. (D-S.)
2. Indemnities.
No indemnities—except for Belgium. (D-S.)
Indemnities for Belgium and Serbia only—to be paid for by all the nations. (R. C.)
3. Belgian government.
To be divided into two autonomous districts. (R. C.)
4. Alsace-Lorraine.
Plebiscite based on voting list at last election before the war. (D-S.)
Undefined plebiscite. (R. C.)
5. Finland.
An independent Finland. (D-S.)
6. Poland.
Independent Poland to be carved from Russia.
Polish districts in Austria and Germany to have "as complete autonomy as possible." (D-S.)
Autonomy of Poland under Russia—boundaries undefined. (R. C.)
7. Ruthvenia, Lithuania, Livonia.
No provision by either side.
8. Rumania.
No annexation of Austrian territory, however desired by Rumanians. No indemnity. (R. C.)
9. Bulgaria.
Annexation of Eastern Macedonia and joint jurisdiction with Greece and Serbia over Salonica district. (D-S.)
10. Balkan districts.
Undefined plebiscite. (R. C.)
11. Slavs in Austria.
"Autonomy," but under Austria. (D-S.)
12. Italians in Austria.
"Autonomy," but under Austria. (D-S.)
Undefined plebiscite. (R. C.)

13. Armenia.
To be restored to Turkey. (D-S.)
"Autonomy" under Turkey. (*Sic!*) (R. C.)
14. Syria, Arabia, and Constantinople.
No provision by either side.
15. Palestine, Greece.
"Support to Jewish colonization." (D-S.)
16. Persia.
To be re-established. (R. C.)
17. Ireland.
Political independence and economic equality.
(D-S.)
18. German colonies.
To be restored. (R. C.)
19. Dardanelles, Suez, and Panama canals.
To be neutralized.

... In a recent statement prepared for *The Nation* (New York), Viscount Bryce takes up and applies the phrase of President Wilson's, "I am proposing, as it were, that the nations should with one accord adopt the doctrine of President Monroe as the doctrine of the world." Pointing out that the United States' share in the war is after all but an anticipation of what would have been certain conflict with Germany in South America had Germany been allowed to win against the European Allied powers, Lord Bryce continues, in part:

Monroe's policy, which was also Washington's, of holding aloof from European complications, was long maintained, and wisely maintained, by America, but the current of events has been too strong to make it possible to stand apart any longer. The whole world has now become one, and must remain one, for the purposes of politics. No great nation can stand out.

Thus the Monroe Doctrine in its old form may seem to have disappeared; for the counterpart to the exclusion of the European powers from interfering with the freedom of American States was the abstention of America from interference in European affairs. Yet what has really happened may turn out to be not a supersession of the doctrine, but rather an extension of what was soundest in its principle.

The unbridled ambition and the aggressive spirit of the German Government are compelling all the nations which love peace and law and freedom to come together to secure for themselves that which America, in proclaiming the Monroe Doctrine against the Holy Alliance, desired to secure for the western continent.

There is need today for a League of Nations which will endeavor to extend its protection to all the world, and not to one continent only. In any such combination to secure justice and tranquillity based upon right, the presence of the United States would be invaluable, and would indeed be necessary if the combination were to secure those blessings for the world.

... Comment continues rife upon the significance of the paragraphs in the annual report of the Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor, read in Buffalo in November, headed "Peace Terms." The more striking portions of this section of the report are as follows:

There is no element in all nations more concerned in the achievement of conditions making for permanent peace between nations than the working people, who constitute the majority of every nation. Working people have never been properly represented in diplomatic affairs. The future must be constructed upon broader lines than the past. We insist, therefore, that the Government of the United States provide adequate and direct representatives of wage-earners among the plenipotentiaries sent to the Peace Congress, and urge upon the labor movements of other countries to take like action.

When nations can send representatives to negotiate peace terms in accord with this concept, we maintain that the basic

provisions of the peace treaty should be formulated with regard to the rights and welfare of the men, women, and children constituting the nations rather than the governments of the nations. The Government should be only an instrumentality of the people instead of dominating and actuating their lives. This terrible war must wipe out all vestiges of the old concept that the nation belongs to the ruler or the government.

We hold that the same principle should apply to relations between the nations, and that secret diplomacy should be replaced by diplomatic representatives responsible to the people of their own nation and received by either the Parliament of the country to which they are accredited or by a representative of the people, responsible to them.

The basis of reconstruction should be the trade-union movement of the various countries. We recommend that an international labor conference of representatives of the trade-union movements of all countries be held at the same time and place as the World Peace Congress, that labor may be in touch with plans under consideration, and may have the benefit of information and counsel of those participating in the Congress.

... Secretary of Commerce Redfield lately called specifically upon "pacifists" and Socialists to see in the contest this country now wages a conflict between their own aims and purposes and powers antithetical to all they themselves could seek for mankind. "The fine flower of human happiness," he declared, which humanitarian, conscientious objector, and obstructionist alike claim they are seeking to cultivate, "cannot be nurtured by the brutal doctrine of blood and iron." Declaring frightfulness to be but the lesser evil which all lovers of mankind must war against, he continued:

Far more serious is the thing of which these are but the evidence—the presence in the world of the malign powers that gave them birth. For we know now that these crimes are not accidental, but deliberate. They are the expression of the will and purpose of power in high places, and by them that power shows its hope and plan to terrorize mankind.

Beside the malign purpose and power thus revealed, how pitiful are the cries of those who call "peace, peace," when there is no peace, or those who speak of social solidarity in the very presence of purposeful, deliberate inhumanity.

This evil thing menaces mankind. It is the deadly foe of the pacifists, for it is the seeker and promoter of war. It is in its very essence all that peaceful men must hate. To the extent that they are peaceful, they must abhor it. If they do not abhor it, they are friends of war and not of peace.

... Reports from Paris tell of the activity of the Council-General of the International Parliamentary Conference in completing the plans for the program of the Conference, to be held in London May 7, 1918. The deliberations of the Conference, it is said, will cover working-class welfare legislation, customs tariffs, methods of dealing with German commercial methods that tend to destroy equality and freedom of international trade, the question of "dumping," and also questions somewhat more political in nature, such as German control in the East, the question of the Danube, etc. After urging upon all the Allies the necessity of "expressing in deeds the fundamental ideas adopted by the International Conference held in June, 1916," a further step was taken, at the instance of Sir John Randles, M. P., which is of more than passing interest to this country. This appears in the form of the following resolution of the Council-General:

The Council-General of the Commercial International Parliamentary Conference meeting in Paris in extraordinary ses-

sion, regard it as a duty to lay before the commission of the Congress and the Senate of the United States the text of the resolutions adopted by the General Council at its meetings of October 8 and 9, in Paris, as well as the records of the business of the meetings held by the Paris Conference in 1916, and in Rome in 1917; it expresses the hope that the American legislative assemblies will give their full attention to the problems, the study of which has been the care of the Parliamentary Conference for the last two years, and that this examination will result in the adoption by these assemblies of the conclusions arrived at by the Conference, in order to realize a unity of thought and make unity of action in the economic sphere possible between all the Allies.

... In an article lately appearing in the *Frankfurter Zeitung*, Prof. Friedrich Meinecke supports the positive declaration of Foreign Secretary von Kühlmann, that Alsace-Lorraine can never be returned to France. Those territories, he explains, are "the firm brace that Bismarck laid around the south and north of Germany, the brace by which he won South Germany, on the ground of pure *Realpolitik*, for the national union; the brace by which he freed it from the burdensome pressure of French power on the Upper Rhine, and by which he placed it in a position to think determinedly for the future, not along Rhenish-federal and particularist, but along German lines." A further point, he claims, is the impossibility of believing that France would be content with these twin provinces, but would soon find it needful to "stretch out her hand towards the Saar Basin, the Palatinate, and the whole left bank of the Rhine." Further, "it would be an elementary necessity and duty of self-preservation for us to get back Alsace-Lorraine at the first opportunity if we lost them now." Lastly, the insistence on the retention of these provinces is apparently the one thing upon which all factions and parties are united—the one link holding warring Germany together most firmly.

... "That ugly Thing" President Wilson called our enemy in his message to Congress. A more scientific definition is given by the scientist John Burroughs, in the *New York Times Sunday Magazine*, in the course of a discussion of the "right of force" raised in a former article by Dr. Crile. He says, in part:

In appealing to the primal law of evolution, the supremacy of might, the German philosophers only show how far behind her enemies their country is in the scale of development, and that she forfeits her right to a place in the family of civilized nations. They put her on a level with the German of the old Stone Age, twenty-five or more thousand years ago, with whom, no doubt, the moral distinctions upon which we build were very obscure.

In view of the foregoing considerations, I cannot agree with Dr. Crile that the German philosophy will prove to be sound if she should win this war. It will still be only a victory of might over right, of the brute over the man, which has happened many times in the jungle. German supremacy might be established for the time being, but German final fitness to survive at the expense of other nationalities would be far from being established. There would still remain in full force the newer biological law which came in with man's development and which makes the peoples in whom it is most developed the fittest for survival. It may suffer temporary eclipse at the hands of the German, scientific barbarism, and organized brutal strength, but it would still remain, even in their midst, to trouble them, and in the end would defeat them.

The success of Prussianism means the death of Americanism, and the overthrow of all other liberal and progressive political systems. Democracy and autocracy are now at death grips, and woe to mankind if the latter succeeds.

... How far Germans themselves are from seeing the above as we see and understand it is indicated in the report of a recent discussion before the Mannheim Merchants' Association led by Professor Kraemer, of the University of Stuttgart. Dr. Kraemer attempted to answer the question, "Why are we Germans so disliked abroad?" in part as follows:

The greatest failing of individual Germans, as well as of the whole nation, is, that we are no psychologists. This explains exactly why foreigners find us so disagreeable—it is because we have no psychological comprehension, and do not estimate the effect of our words and our manners upon strangers; otherwise we should be careful to act more in accordance with the ideas of foreigners, and not behave ourselves when abroad as though we were at home; yet, on the other hand, we should not sink all our particular German qualities out of a mistaken regard for foreign manners.

Our unpopularity with the English is due to our material and intellectual advancement, which awakens dislike and jealousy. England feels her decline approaching and wants to overthrow her ambitious opponent. In France matters were going much better in the last few years, until the malevolent influence of England brought about a recrudescence of the old hatred. The Italians have a special dislike of all foreigners. It is true, they have a great respect for our sense of order, and a very cool respect also for our ability; but their artistic sensibilities cause them to find a lack of repose and graciousness in the German manner. The Russians have mostly known the Germans as instructors, and that has not filled them with love for us. The Swiss are fundamentally friendly to Germany, but he is accustomed to use the French and Italian tongue, rather than that of the German Empire. It irritates him that we so easily forget abroad the political frontiers and are constantly boasting of how much better we do things at home.

In the Latin nations, the old romantic spirit is nourished in the schools, but in Germany the children are taught that history begins in German nationalism. To these races the romantic ideal seems to be threatened by the spirit of work, of exertion, and of force and excellence of the Germans, which they deem carried to excess. Our development in intellectual and economic relations is felt by our enemies as a gloomy threatening of old privileges. When they speak of our militarism, they mean the rigidity in the form of our whole national life. The short, harsh tone of command is hated abroad; it is said of us also that we eat and drink too much and make altogether too much noise in the world.

... A letter from Marianne Hainisch, President of the Austrian Council of Women, which was read at the opening session of the National Council of Women, meeting in Washington, D. C., December 10, 1917, reads as follows:

Each warring nation is today, after three years of battle, determined to come forth victor. This is not to be looked for, even though some are beginning to realize that it is unthinkable that one or the other will be so totally down-trodden or destroyed that they would give up retaliation. We stand, therefore, before the sorrowful situation that the end of the war, brought about by the use of weapons, will only be an introduction to new wars. It therefore appears to me as my duty that the women do all in their power to end the needless slaughter.

The women are powerless, but not without influence over the brothers, husbands, and sons. Therefore, I venture an appeal to them. What I would ask is that you see to it that the councils of all warring nations receive my request: that the women of the whole world, on a certain day, in their own country inaugurate a peace petition.

You would confer a great favor if you could bring to the notice of all sister councils this request of the Austrian Council of Women, as I am unable to reach them.

... Reports from Australia state that "from Queens-town to Western Australia the demand for another con-

scription referendum is rising," owing to a revitalizing of the question by the news of the Italian reverses. It is stated also that the adoption of conscription by New Zealand, Canada and the United States has shown to many that it is not, in all instances, and wholly *per se*, incompatible with democracy.

... The American Friends' National Service Committee, co-operating with the English Friends' Service Committee, announces that among its work of reconstruction in Europe can be counted the setting up of two planing mills where lumber for portable houses is turned out, the equipment of a hospital in the Marne district, and general relief and reconstruction work in nine French villages. In all, about 130 men and 15 women have been sent over to France in this work. Until the Government here shall have decided definitely the status and disposal of conscientious objectors on religious grounds, the Committee are selecting for their work only men over the draft age. The physical and mental requirements for the Committee's work are so high that few of the men exempted from the draft as unfit can be used.

... Including the Red Cross and the American Friends, there are at least thirty-six organizations now engaged in reconstruction work in Europe, according to the count of the *New York Evening Post*. This paper recently sent a questionnaire to each of these organizations, with the object of finding out what were its particular services at present and as planned for the future. This work, as found in the replies received, includes rebuilding houses and parts of villages, supplying food and clothing to the destitute, opening and management of hospitals, baby homes, relief centers and food kitchens, supplying ice to the sick and wounded near the firing-line, training the wholly or partially blinded soldiers and sailors in trades by which they can earn a livelihood, succoring churches in Belgium and France, supplying seeds and farming implements in possible farming districts to returned soldiers and peasants, maintaining trade schools for the crippled, special relief for inhabitants of destroyed areas, sheltering refugees, providing for lost children or old people, collecting and providing for all lost children or those whose parents cannot care for them, and providing supplies to military hospitals. This work is being done in every case by American men and women or American money or material aid furnished in America, and often all combined, in conjunction with French, British and Belgian organizations for similar purposes.

... In his recently issued annual report President Nicholas Murray Butler, of Columbia University, defends the practice of his University in cases in which allegations have been raised that Columbia was attempting to repress free speech in its Faculty. Explaining painstakingly that acceptance of a position on the Faculty of an educational institution imposes some slight responsibility upon a professor to consider the welfare of his institution and to abide by its desires and prejudices, President Butler goes on to a vivid characterization of the sort of professor who does not admit this obligation, as follows:

These are for the most part men who know so many things which are not so that they make ignorance appear to be not only interesting, but positively important. They abound just now in the lower and more salable forms of literary production, and they are not without representation in academic societies. The time has not yet come, however, when rational persons can contemplate with satisfaction the rule of the literary and academic Bolsheviks or permit them to seize responsibility for the intellectual life of the nation.

... The annual report of the Secretary of the Interior reveals the perfection in that department during the past few years of an efficient machine for national, if not international, service. "What can you do to serve me?" That is, the Secretary declares, the essential question which the Government asks of each department, and which his own has striven to answer. He says:

The answer of this department is that it has put every agency and activity which it has at the service of those departments more directly concerned with war making. Our men of scientific knowledge—metallurgists, chemists, engineers, topographers—have found new work at their hands. The homesteaders and the miners on the public lands have been released from their obligations if they go into the army or show themselves to be of greater service off their lands than on them.

The Reclamation Service on a million and a quarter acres of irrigated lands and the Indians on a hundred reservations joined in the campaign for more meat and more wheat. The Patent Office has been searched for new devices that could be brought into use to kill the submarine or limit its destructiveness, for the plans of heretofore unused lethal weapons, and for the formulæ of improved or unknown sources of power.

Before the war actually came this department had compiled the data which showed the power of the nation in mineral and chemical resources, our possible needs, and how they could be met at home or where abroad. Prepared lists of those men who had special knowledge or were of skill along the lines of our own activities enabled us to expand as the call was made.

... In Secretary Lane's report is to be found philosophy as well as fact. Following an elaboration of the actual service rendered, as sketched above, he adds his own observations upon the phenomenon of a democracy at war, as follows:

A democracy making war is never an agreeable sight, for it is not in its normal line of life. And those who sneer or jeer because it does not play the game as well as might be, pay an unconscious compliment to the merits of free institutions. It takes time to accustom men to the short, hard words of command, and to the surrender of personal judgment. It is not easy, either, for a nation to turn its back upon the conception of a world where justice works out its ends by quiet processes, and in its stead come to the stern belief that the ultimate court is a battlefield. So if there is wrenching and side-slipping and confusion there should be no surprise. The surprise to me has been with what comparative ease the transition has been made, and how much unconscious preparation for the new work had been already made.

Men are already thinking of the greater America that they believe to be coming when the war is done.

This new America, as the old, will contribute to the world raw products with most generous hand. But the ultimate resource of the nation is not that which lies within the ground, but that which vibrates in man's brain. Therefore, out of the struggle and torture that we shall pass through, and the reverses and triumphs that we shall meet, there should evolve the conception of America as the center of the world's thought, an American that will give that leadership and direction to the scientific, literary, and social thought of the world that we pride ourselves we have recently given to its political thought. Our status in this war gives us a

place of moral ascendancy from which, if we are great enough to be humble, we can become real masters of men, conquerors of the invisible kingdom of man's mind.

... In his annual report Secretary of War Baker states with some definiteness that he does not favor universal military training as a regular national policy. His reassurance to those who have seen perdition in the draft law runs as follows:

The department has not sought, and does not now seek, legislation on the subject, chiefly for the reason that the formation of a permanent military policy will inevitably be affected by the arrangement consequent upon the termination of the present war. Civilized men must hope that the future has in store a relief from the burden of armament, and the destruction and waste of war. However vain that hope may appear in the midst of the most devastating and destructive war in the history of the race, it persists—perhaps because we are encouraged by the analogous substitution of courts for force in the settlement of private controversies; perhaps because all the perfections of nature teach us that they are the product of processes which have eliminated waste and substituted constructive for destructive principles.

When a permanent military policy, therefore, comes to be adopted, it will doubtless be conceived in a spirit which will be adequate to preserve against any possible attack those vital principles of liberty upon which democratic institutions are based, and yet be so restrained as in no event to foster the growth of mere militarist ambitions or to excite the apprehension of nations with whom it is our first desire to live in harmonious and just accord.

AMONG THE PEACE ORGANIZATIONS

AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY

New England Department

Director Tryon has recently made addresses before the Equal Franchise League at the Falmouth Hotel, Portland, and also before the congregation of St. Lawrence's Church, Portland, where he conducted Sunday morning service. As secretary of the Maine Peace Society he has sent to past members and to present members whose subscriptions are about to expire invitations to renew their connection with the State organization and to take the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE* for the coming year. As he is also making an effort to secure new members within his field, he would appreciate having sent to him lists of persons to whom invitations to join the society may be given. As heretofore, he has prepared the annual article on peace and arbitration for the American Year Book. He has been appointed by the Governor of Maine to serve as an associate member of the Legal Advisory Board for District No. 1 of the city of Portland. Members of the bar who are assigned to these boards serve without pay. Their work is to assist in giving necessary advice and assistance to registrants in preparing exemption claims, questionnaires, and other papers required of drafted men.

Central West Department

Following out the spirit of the editorial "Win and End the War" in the December *ADVOCATE*, the Director has associated himself with such movements as would permit active demonstration of the American Peace Society's desire to support the Government and at the same time allow the profession and practice of the prin-

ciples of "a governed word." He is registered with the United States Public Service Reserve, and has offered his services to the Federal Food Administrator for Illinois. He has also served as Legal Adviser for one of the local draft boards. Opportunities have been found for several addresses recently, in which he spoke of the war and its relation to world organization and permanent peace.

South Atlantic States Department

The Director for the South Atlantic States has just returned to Atlanta from a trip to North Carolina, visiting Guilford College, Greensboro, Durham and Fayetteville. The Executive Committee of the North Carolina Peace Society met at Greensboro, December 4 and elected the following officers for the year: E. P. Wharton, President; J. W. Scott, First Vice-President; L. L. Hobbs, Secretary; Joseph J. Brown, Treasurer. The officers are men of high reputation throughout the State, and thoroughly committed to the great cause of world peace through a governed world. Other vice-presidents will be selected from different sections of the State.

While at Durham Dr. J. J. Hall attended the annual meeting of the Baptists of the State, and was accorded a very hearty welcome. He presented a resolution of good cheer, confidence, and hope to all comrades of other lands. The resolution was unanimously adopted, and a copy of it will be sent through official channels to those across the seas. While at Fayetteville the Director made two addresses, one on "Christianity and the War," the other on the work of the Red Cross. He also spoke by request at Guilford College on "The Lansdowne Note."

The director is pleased to find wherever he goes a very hearty indorsement of the position taken by the American Peace Society as expressed in *THE ADVOCATE OF PEACE*. It has opened a new page for peace workers the world over. It calls not for peace first, nor for peace at any price, but for peace by righteousness and law.

Pacific Coast Department.

The Director has recently sent out a letter addressed to young friends and their instructors and teachers in various schools and colleges throughout the country, giving a succinct biography for the study of the present international situation. This list and his comment thereon run as follows.

The first three books that follow were written by Friends, and deal with war from the Quaker standpoint. Nos. 4 and 5 were also written from the Christian point of view, though not by Friends. The last four discuss the diplomatic and political questions relating to war and peace.

The books may be ordered from Prof. Allen D. Hole, Richmond, Ind., the American Peace Society, Colorado Building, Washington, D. C., or through Robert C. Root, 1011 Hobart Building, San Francisco, California.

1. "Christ and War." Wm. E. Wilson, B. D., London. 70c.
2. "War from the Friends' Point of View." John W. Graham, M. A. 65c.
3. "The True Way of Life." Edward Grubb, M. A., London. 75c.
4. "Christianity and International Peace." Chas. E. Jefferson, D. D. \$1.25
5. "The Forks of the Road." Washington Gladden, D. D. 40c.